and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207). Recent amendments to the Rules of Practice and Procedure pertinent to five-year reviews, including the text of subpart F of part 207, are published at 63 FR 30599, June 5, 1998, and may be downloaded from the Commission's World Wide Web site at http://www.usitc.gov/rules.htm.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 28, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian R. Allen (202–708–4728), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (http://www.usitc.gov).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—On August 5, 1999, the Commission determined that responses to its notice of institution of the subject five-year reviews were such that full reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(5) of the Act should proceed (64 FR 45276, August 19, 1999). A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's web site.

Participation in these reviews and public service list.—Persons, including industrial users of the subject merchandise and, if the merchandise is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations, wishing to participate in these reviews as parties must file an entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as provided in section 201.11 of the Commission's rules, by 45 days after publication of this notice. A party that filed a notice of appearance following publication of the Commission's notice of institution of these reviews need not file an additional notice of appearance. The Secretary will maintain a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to these reviews.

Limited disclosure of business proprietary information (BPI) under an administrative protective order (APO) and BPI service list.—Pursuant to section 207.7(a) of the Commission's rules, the Secretary will make BPI gathered in these reviews available to authorized applicants under the APO issued in these reviews, provided that the application is made by 45 days after publication of this notice. Authorized applicants must represent interested parties, as defined by 19 U.S.C. 1677(9), who are parties to these reviews. A party granted access to BPI following publication of the Commission's notice of institution of these reviews need not reapply for such access. A separate service list will be maintained by the Secretary for those parties authorized to receive BPI under the APO.

Staff report.—The prehearing staff report in these reviews will be placed in the nonpublic record on February 17, 2000, and a public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to section 207.64 of the Commission's rules.

Hearing.—The Commission will hold a hearing in connection with the review beginning at 9:30 a.m. on March 9, 2000, at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building. Requests to appear at the hearing should be filed in writing with the Secretary to the Commission on or before March 1, 2000. A nonparty who has testimony that may aid the Commission's deliberations may request permission to present a short statement at the hearing. All parties and nonparties desiring to appear at the hearing and make oral presentations should attend a prehearing conference to be held at 9:30 a.m. on March 6, 2000, at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building. Oral testimony and written materials to be submitted at the public hearing are governed by sections 201.6(b)(2), 201.13(f), 207.24, and 207.66 of the Commission's rules. Parties must submit any request to present a portion of their hearing testimony *in camera* no later than 7 days prior to the date of the hearing.

Written submissions.—Each party to these reviews may submit a prehearing brief to the Commission. Prehearing briefs must conform with the provisions of section 207.65 of the Commission's rules; the deadline for filing is February 29, 2000. Parties may also file written testimony in connection with their presentation at the hearing, as provided in section 207.24 of the Commission's rules, and posthearing briefs, which must conform with the provisions of section 207.67 of the Commission's rules. The deadline for filing posthearing briefs is March 20, 2000; witness testimony must be filed no later than three days before the hearing. In addition, any person who has not entered an appearance as a party to these review may submit a written statement of information pertinent to the subject of these reviews on or before March 20, 2000. On April 17, 2000, the Commission will make available to parties all information on which they have not had an opportunity to comment. Parties may submit final comments on this information on or before April 21, 2000, but such final comments must not contain new factual information and must otherwise comply with section 207.68 of the Commission's rules. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission's rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means.

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's rules, each document filed by a party to these reviews must be served on all other parties to these reviews (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: September 30, 1999.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–26045 Filed 10–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 104–TAA–7 (Review); AA1921–198–200 (Review); and 731–TA–3 (Review)]

Sugar From the European Union; Sugar From Belgium, France, and Germany; and Sugar and Syrups From Canada

Determinations

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission determines,[2] pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930

[1] The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

[2] Commissioners Crawford and Askey dissenting.

(19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act), that revocation of the countervailing duty order on sugar from the European Union would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. The Commission also determines[3] that revocation of the antidumping findings on sugar from Belgium, France, and Germany would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. Further, the Commission determines that revocation of the antidumping duty order on sugar and syrups from Canada would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on October 1, 1998 (63 FR 52759), and determined on January 7, 1999, that it would conduct full reviews (64 FR 4901, February 1, 1999). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's reviews and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on March 11, 1999 (64 FR 12178). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on July 15, 1999, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this investigation to the Secretary of Commerce on September 28, 1999. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3238 (September 1999), entitled Sugar from the European Union; Sugar from Belgium, France, and Germany; and Sugar and Syrups from Canada: Investigation Nos. 104–TAA–7 (Review); AA1921–198–200 (Review); and 731–TA–3 (Review).

Issued: September 29, 1999.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–26042 Filed 10–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[3] Commissioners Crawford and Askey dissenting.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Importation of Controlled Substances; Notice of Withdrawal

As set forth in the **Federal Register** (FR Doc. 99–20435) Vol. 64, No. 152 at page 43224, dated August 9, 1999, ISP Freetown Fine Chemicals, Inc., 238 South Main Street, Assonet, Massachusetts 02702 made application to the Drug Enforcement Administration for registration as an importer of 2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine (7396).

A registered bulk manufacturer of 2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine requested a hearing to deny the proposed registration of ISP Freetown Fine Chemicals. ISP Freetown Fine Chemicals has requested by letter that its application be withdrawn. Therefore, ISP Freetown Fine Chemicals application to import 2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine is hereby withdrawn.

Dated: September 24, 1999.

John H. King,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–25903 Filed 10–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 96–32]

Pettigrew Rexall Drugs Reinstatement of Registration

On February 16, 1999, the Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) issued a final order revoking DEA Certificate of Registration AP0406911 issued to Pettigrew Rexall Drugs (Respondent), effective March 25, 1999. See 64 FR 8855 (February 23, 1999). The Deputy Administrator further ordered that the revocation be stayed for six months from the effective date of the order ''during which time Respondent must present evidence to the Deputy Administrator of Mr. Pettigrew's completion of a training course regarding the proper handling of controlled substances and must submit to random unannounced inspections by DEA personnel without requiring an administrative inspection warrant.'' *Id.*

The Deputy Administrator noted that should Respondent not comply with these conditions or if it is determined that further violations have occurred, an order would be issued lifting the stay and Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration would be revoked. The Deputy Administrator further noted that should Respondent submit the required information in a timely manner and it is determined that no violations have occurred, a subsequent order would be issued reinstating Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration and renewing it without limitations.

By letter dated June 4, 1999, Respondent's counsel forwarded a copy of a document entitled, ''Certification of Continuing Pharmaceutical Education Participation'' from the University of Tennessee College of Pharmacy dated May 28, 1999. The document seemed to indicate that Jimmie Max Pettigrew completed the course entitled Tennessee Pharmacy and Drug Law. In addition, the document had handwritten notations of grades allegedly received for the eight assignments of the course. In the letter forwarding this document, Respondent's counsel stated that ''[w]e are submitting this certification of continuing pharmaceutical education participation copy as evidence of Mr. Pettigrew's compliance with your order of February 16, 1999.''

By letter dated June 8, 1999, the Deputy Administrator's office notified Respondent's counsel that based upon the information provided, the Deputy Administrator was unable to determine whether Mr. Pettigrew has successfully completed a course regarding the proper handling of controlled substances. The certification was not signed and there was no indication who wrote the grades listed on the certification.

Thereafter on July 20, 1999, Respondent's counsel forwarded affidavits from the Assistant Dean for Continuing Education and Public Service for the University of Tennessee College of Pharmacy and from Jimmie Max Pettigrew, Respondent's owner and pharmacist, which indicate that Mr. Pettigrew has successfully completed a course in the proper handling of controlled substances.

No evidence has been presented to the Deputy Administrator that any inspections by DEA have revealed any further violations relating to the handling of controlled substances.

The Deputy Administrator concludes that Respondent has met the conditions set forth in the February 16, 1999 final order, and as a result, DEA Certificate of Registration AP0406911 shall be reinstated and renewed. Respondent is reminded that it is required to indicate that there has been action taken against its DEA Certificate of Registration in response to the liability question on any future applications.